

## REMARKS

The Specification has been amended. Claims 1 - 4, 14, 16, and 19 have been amended to clarify the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. Claim 21 has been added, and Claim 11 has been cancelled from the application without prejudice. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments or added claim, all of which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claims 1 - 10 and 12 - 21 are now in the application.

### I. Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §101

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action dated January 26, 2007 (hereinafter, “the Office Action”) states that Claims 19 - 20 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The preamble of independent Claim 19 (as originally presented) specifies “A computer program product for providing federated identity management within a distributed content aggregation framework, the computer program product embodied on one or more computer-readable media and comprising ...” (Claim 19, lines 1 - 3, emphasis added). The holding in *In re Beauregard*, 53 F.3d 1583, 1584, 35 USPQ2d 1383, 1384 (Fed. Cir. 1995), states that “... computer programs embodied in a tangible medium ... are patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101” (emphasis added).

See also Section IV.B.1.(a) of the “Examination Guidelines for Computer-Related

Inventions, Final Version”, dated March 29, 1996 (1184 OG 87), which states:

... a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the medium which permit the computer program’s functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. (emphasis added)

Accordingly, Claim 19 (as originally presented) specifies patentable subject matter.

Dependent Claim 20 is patentable by virtue of its dependency from Claim 19. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §101 rejection.

## II. Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §102(e)

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action states that Claims 1 - 9 and 11 - 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 7,134,137 B2 to Joshi et al. (hereinafter, “Joshi”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1, as currently presented, recites:

A computer-implemented method of providing cross-domain authentication in a computing environment, comprising steps of:  
providing security credentials of an entity to an initial point of contact that provides content aggregation in the computing environment;  
passing the provided credentials from the initial point of contact to a trust proxy;  
authenticating the passed credentials with an authentication service in a local security domain of the trust proxy to authenticate the entity for accessing content from at least one local content service, each of the at least one local content services operable to provide its content from the local security domain for aggregation, by the initial point of contact, in an aggregated view; and  
using the authentication performed by the local authentication service to seamlessly authenticate the entity for accessing other content from at least one remote content service in each of at least one selected remote security domains,

each of the at least one remote content services operable to provide its content from its remote security domain for aggregation, by the initial point of contact, in the aggregated view. (emphasis added)

As the Federal Circuit stated in *W.L. Gore & Associates v. Garlock, Inc.*, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984), “Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of *each element* of the claim under consideration.” (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that Joshi fails to teach, or suggest, (at least) the above-underlined limitations of Claim 1. Accordingly, Joshi does not anticipate Claim 1 according to *W.L. Gore & Associates*.

Independent Claim 16, as currently presented, recites:

A system for enabling an entity to have seamless access to a plurality of aggregated services which have different identity requirements, comprising:  
means for initially authenticating the entity, by a first authentication component, for access to a first service using an identity provided by the entity;  
means for mapping the provided identification to the differing identity requirements of at least one other service to be aggregated with the first service, thereby establishing mapped identity requirements for each of the at least one other services;  
means for subsequently authenticating the entity for access to each of the at least one other services, by an authentication component associated with that other service, using the mapped identity requirements; and  
means for aggregating each of the at least one other services and the first service, if the authentications thereof are successful, into an aggregated result. (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Joshi fails to teach, or suggest, (at least) the above-underlined limitations of Claim 16. Accordingly, Joshi does not anticipate Claim 16 according to *W.L. Gore & Associates*.

Independent Claim 19, as currently presented, recites:

A computer program product for providing federated identity management within a distributed content aggregation framework, the computer program product embodied on one or more computer-readable media and comprising:

- computer-readable program code for providing, to the content aggregation framework by a using entity, initial identity information that identifies the using entity for accessing a first content source that is operable within a first security domain;

- computer-readable program code for authenticating the initial identity information by a first authentication service in the first security domain;

- computer-readable program code for conveying results of the authentication by the first authentication service to at least one selected other authentication service, each of which is associated with a remote security domain that is distinct from the first security domain;

- computer-readable program code for using the conveyed results to authenticate the using entity to each of the selected other authentication services for accessing a remote content source operable within the remote security domain that is associated with that selected other authentication service, without requiring the using entity to provide additional identity information; and

aggregating content from the first content source and other content from each of the remote content sources for presentation in an aggregated view rendered by the content aggregation framework. (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Joshi fails to teach, or suggest, (at least) the above-underlined limitations of Claim 19. Accordingly, Joshi does not anticipate Claim 19 according to *W.L. Gore & Associates*.

Dependent Claims 2 - 9, 12 - 15, 17 - 18, and 20 - 21 are deemed patentable by virtue of (at least) the patentability of the independent claims from which they depend. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §102 rejection.

III. Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §103(a)

Paragraph 8 of the Office Action states that Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Joshi in view of U. S. Patent 7,131,000 to Bradec. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As demonstrated above, Applicants' independent Claim 1 specifies limitations not taught by Joshi. Applicants respectfully submit that these limitations are also not taught by Bradec, and accordingly, Bradec cannot be combined with Joshi to render dependent Claim 10 obvious. Furthermore, dependent claim is deemed patentable by virtue of (at least) the patentability of independent Claim 1 from which it depends. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §103 rejection.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/ /#40,999/

Marcia L. Doubet  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168  
Phone: 407-343-7586; Fax: 407-343-7587